



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

markets in backward and partially civilized countries. The present war is said to be at bottom a commercial war. Fear of unfair competition for the markets of Egypt, Morocco, Persia, Asia Minor, China, Congo, and Mexico is the cause most likely to result in future wars. The open door and equality of economic opportunities for the free development of the commerce of all nations must count more and more in the calculations of statesmen in removing the fundamental causes of war.

How will it help the cause of a durable peace for the United States to join either a pro-German or anti-German alliance or become entangled in European politics? Even if all the European countries should become parties to a league of peace, were we to join it we should live in constant apprehension of being drawn into disputes between European powers to compel one or the other to arbitrate its ambitions. We should have to prepare to face the constant menace of being a party to a world war. We don't want any excuse to intervene in Europe. If we do get into trouble it will probably be over some place like Mexico, or the Philippines, or the Panama Canal, or Venezuela, or our rights of commerce and passage on the high seas.

The United States owes a duty to civilization to continue our sensible policy of isolation, of minding our own business, of keeping ourselves clear of the hopeless animosities of war-ridden Europe. We must stay aloof from their hostilities, in which our power will count much more as a neutral than as a belligerent party. We shall have our hands full before long with the Monroe Doctrine, viz., that this hemisphere is not to be made a field for European aggression or intervention. In return we impliedly agree to protect the interests of honest investment and commerce in the weaker Latin American States. We forbid European intervention, but we impliedly guarantee to remove the cause by which it would be justified. So far circumstances have favored us and have enabled us to fulfill our pretensions (some may regard it as a gigantic bluff) that we are the policemen and if any regulating needs to be done we will do it. We impliedly assume to be responsible for the protection of trade and foreign capital and life in so far as they are entitled to protection in such countries. If we fail to do our duty, Europeans will sooner or later undertake the collection of claims on behalf of European creditors for themselves. They will insist on a right to occupy Mexico and collect her revenues, and this will lead to war with Europe.

If we really believe in a League to Enforce Peace we don't need to wait four or five years, until the end of the present European war. The Monroe Doctrine is one-sided and implies an extension of the sovereignty of the United States beyond its boundaries. The more evident this becomes the more it will be resented by Latin America. For this reason we need to cultivate Pan Americanism, leading to a partnership or cooperative agreement between the States of the Western Hemisphere. Thus America, instead of entangling herself in the complications of Europe, may develop an American league, protecting the American continent from aggression, keeping the peace between American countries, and obviating any occasion for armed intervention by European powers.

If intervention by the United States in Mexico becomes necessary, it might be carried out under the guid-

ance and upon the recommendations of a Pan American International Court or Council, after full opportunity for hearing by all parties concerned. In this way America could set an effective example in establishing international law and peace upon a solid foundation.

We might indeed become party to an alliance to be formed for keeping the peace and enforcing international law upon the high seas, where the questions involved concern all nations. If this marine league were formed first among a part of the nations, it might well draw to itself the cooperation of all. A voice in such an alliance for the government of the seas would seem far more desirable to Canada, Australia, and the United States than membership in a European league.

The logic of events would seem to indicate, therefore, that the next step toward world government will be a continuation of the several federations or alliances of existing powers, holding together as best they can to prevent aggression from without and disruption from within. Fear of war will continue to be the strongest incentive to a merger of nations into a supernational State. When we have developed a series of supernational governments and a sea government, each charged with some portion of the world's problems, these may evolve into the organs of a world State. A standing conference of these three or four greater States may become the nucleus of the ultimate world State or government, overriding dreams of national conquest, regulating armaments, keeping the peace, administering justice, creating political conditions which do full justice to the free development of all people on land and sea, and making the irresponsible and unauthorized resort to war a curiosity of ancient and primitive history. With Canadians and Australians and New Zealanders fighting and dying for the British Empire, it is reasonable to believe that national patriotism is capable of ultimate expansion to upholding an international union in a world government. Wars fought in that behalf would be worth fighting.

BRIEF PEACE NOTES

. . . *War and Peace*, the English periodical with which we are all familiar, presents in its December number a definite proposal. It points out that the proposal is not a plea for peace negotiations, for the early termination of the war, for an early, incomplete, or patched-up peace; it does not deny the necessity of a "knock-out blow," or of a "fight to a finish," or of the punishment of the Germans. The proposal reads:

"It is that now, during the course of the war, the Allies should decide between themselves, and if possible with the neutrals, at a new Paris Conference convened for that purpose, the character of the international arrangements by which, after this war, the rights and security of all nations—including the rights and security of Germany—are to be protected, and the peace of the world preserved, and should give as much publicity to their arrangements as was given to the commercial arrangements discussed at the Paris Conference early in the present year."

. . . Among the many responses to the President's note to the belligerents appears the following commendation from a sister neutral republic: "The most meritorious

personal initiative of President Wilson will find a mighty echo in Switzerland. True to the obligations arising from observing the strictest neutrality, united by the same friendship with the States of both warring groups of powers, situated like an island amidst the seething waves of the terrible world war, with its ideal and material interests most sensibly jeopardized and violated, our country is filled with a deep longing for peace and ready to assist by its small means to stop the endless sufferings caused by the war and brought before its eyes by daily contact with the interned, the severely wounded, and those expelled, and to establish the foundations for a beneficial cooperation of the peoples.

"The Swiss Federal Council is, therefore, glad to seize the opportunity to support the efforts of the President of the United States. It would consider itself happy if it could act in any, no matter how modest, a way, for the rapprochement of the peoples now engaged in the struggle, and for reaching a lasting peace."

... Discussing the question of limitation of armaments as a preventative of war, and concluding that it is much like pulling a bulldog's teeth to keep him from fighting, Mr. T. Miyaoka, a prominent Japanese publicist and legal adviser to the Tokyo Chamber of Commerce, declares that permanent peace must come from within, not from without. In his reply to a questionnaire sent out by the *Central Organ for a Durable Peace*, which he permits *The Japan Peace Movement* to quote, he refers to such proposals as limitation of armaments, enforced peace, and so on, as based on conditions before the war and oblivious of the lessons learned since. "We have made many discoveries since then. The first discovery was that 'an armed peace' was a meaningless expression, and that such a thing did not and could not exist. The second discovery we made in Japan was that the line of human demarcation usually called 'the White and the Yellow' did not exist. The real line of distinction was militarism and anti-militarism. The third discovery was that the usage of nations known as international law was either susceptible of changes without the consent of all, or was incapable of being asserted in an effective manner like municipal laws. If the whole of Europe going into war was powerless to command obedience to certain well-defined rules of international law, the whole of Europe rising in armed conflict would be unable to prevent the outbreak of wars in the future.

"In my opinion mankind is just awakening to the truth that if peace is to be preserved among men, that movement will have to come from within, not from without. No amount of coercion will have the effect of putting an end to the progressive development of armaments, of making wars obsolete, or of ensuring compliance with international law. . . . And yet I am not a pessimist. On the contrary, I am an optimist. By the time this war is over, mankind will have learned that the aim of a State can, no more than that of an individual, be attained by the exercise of brute force. Militarism will have proved itself a failure, even viewed as a means of attaining the object of a State. It will have crushed not only the boasted 'Kultur,' but the strength of militarism itself.

"New ideas will then arise. Human thought will begin to evolve in new grooves. I do not think the day is far distant when mankind will smile at the way the

nations of the earth in all their wisdom once sought to discover in a series of diplomatic conferences the most effectual means of preserving peace by the limitation of armaments."

... While "the approach to peace" is still a pathway difficult to find and hazardous to tread, another possible solution of the difficulty is indicated in Geneva dispatches to the London *Daily News*. This concerns the rumored Austrian effort to conduct peace negotiations with Britain and France, to which purpose, it is stated, a party of Austrian diplomats are already located in Geneva. This is not at all regarded as an attempt on Austria's part to desert her allies, but is based on the assumption that "the vexed question of the evacuation of territory could best be settled by direct conference between belligerent nations which do not come into direct conflict in war." It is implied that a general conference might occur after the evacuation had taken place. Presumably, on the same basis, Germany would regard it as possible to treat directly with Italy. "It is no secret," says the same report, "that the man behind the peace movement in Austria is Count Berchtold, former Foreign Secretary, who is supported by the Hungarian opposition and threatens to sweep from power Count Tisza, the masterful Hungarian leader."

... Mr. George Bernard Shaw expresses the opinion that the predominant sentiment roused by the war is simply loathing of it and agonizing doubt whether it is really inevitable or was ever necessary. "Of course we ought to discuss peace," he said. "In every war peace should be continually discussed from the very beginning until it is actually achieved. . . . But if they aim only at a division of the spoils between King Tweedledum and King Tweedledee, it will not matter twopence to you or to me what the terms are."

... In a communication addressed to the British people, Arthur Ponsonby, formerly member of Parliament, but recently retired to private life by reason of opposition to his views on the war, said:

"What has been the effect of our attempting to crush German militarism by force of arms?"

"We have established militarism at home. We have deprived men of their liberty, punished men for their consciences, censored opinion and suppressed free speech. Militarism can only be crushed by the people themselves in a country where a free democracy exists.

"We cannot free the German people by warfare, but we can enslave our own.

"The war for liberty and justice has yet to come. It will be the war of united democracy against the stale traditions of discredited governments—not a war of people against people. It will be a war against bad conditions, against poverty, misery, and ignorance.

"The real enemy is established inside every country. It is the spirit of tyranny, greed, materialism, intolerance and militarism. It is the unfair distribution of wealth, the neglect of education, the idolization of riches. The victims of that enemy are to be found in slums, in workhouses, in asylums, and in prisons.

"Why not make ready to fight that enemy instead of wasting life and treasure in the slaughtering of men who are as anxious as you are to turn their attention to the real evils that surround them?"

... Declaring that "peace could be made this winter with honor and success," Charles Roden Buxton, an Englishman and one-time British diplomat, attempts to

answer the question, "If a reasonable peace is attainable, why is peace not made?" This answer occurs in a document written by him to the American people and recently smuggled past the censor. He says, in part:

"There can only be one answer—because the governments are not aiming at a reasonable peace. I do not profess to know the exact objects which they have in view. What I do know is that they must have other and further objects in view than those which the people of this country took up arms to secure. One of them, indeed, they have openly announced. They have 'approved' the resolutions of the Paris economic conference, which involve the establishment of a commercial boycott against the central powers. To add this to our objects means to prolong the war long after it might otherwise have been ended. Beyond this we are kept in the dark. But it is probable that the objects which the governments have in view include, in addition, one or more of the following: The annexation of most or all of Germany's colonial empire; the annexation of Constantinople by Russia; the annexation of the north Dalmatian coast by Italy, or possibly (to use Lloyd George's language) a 'knock-out' without any defined object whatever.

"The issue is now clearly raised between the original, legitimate defensive objects of the war, whose realization might lead to permanent peace, and the new, aggressive, and partially concealed objects, which would lead to the perpetuation of war in the Europe of the future.

"This is a serious and menacing situation. The only escape from it is to be found in a vigorous expression of public opinion, both in Parliament and in the country, in favor of negotiation by the allied governments. The policy of an indefinite war and a dangerous peace is being pushed also. Those who do not believe in it must act now, and must refuse any support to a policy of mere conquest."

... Another uncensored contribution to British anti-war thought in war-time has been made by Bertrand Russell, English philosopher and mathematician, and distinguished author of "Justice in War-time" (Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago). Mr. Russell writes: "After all, I see that none of the issues in the war are as important as peace; that harm done by a peace which does not concede all that we desire is as nothing in comparison to the harm done by the continuance of the fighting. While all who have power in Europe speak for what they falsely believe to be the interests of their separate nations, I am compelled by a profound conviction to speak for all the nations in the name of Europe. In the name of Europe I appeal to you to bring us peace." Copies of the complete letter, as well as copies of similar letters from Arthur Ponsonby, Charles Roden Buxton, and Charles P. Trevelyan, may be obtained on application to the American Neutral Conference Committee, 70 Fifth avenue, New York City.

... In contrast to these appeals from distinguished citizens of one of the nations most keenly suffering the effects of the war runs the protest recently signed by fifty prelates and laymen of various religious denominations in this country, who unite in a warning to this country that a premature peace "may bring a curse instead of a blessing." Among the signers of this document are President Hibben, of Princeton; "Billy" Sunday, Lyman Abbott, George Wharton Pepper, Gifford Pinchot, and James M. Speer. The declaration is made that the duty of the Christians of America is to judge the rights and wrongs of the war and to distinguish between the innocent and the guilty. Righteousness as the triumph of peace is deferred by them to "peace as the triumph of righteousness, and not the mere sheathing of a sword."

... The New York *American*, often accused of distinctly pro-German tendencies, in a recent editorial conceives of the European war as a struggle primarily for the "bridge between Europe and Asia," from Constantinople to the Persian Gulf. On this basis, it yet affirms that "a reasonable peace treaty" can terminate the war and reconcile all differences, and this it conceives to be: for Germany, the right to the "Berlin-Bagdadbahn," or the land-and-water route to the Far East; for Austria-Hungary, "the right to be freed from the constant menaces and disturbances in the turbulent and half-civilized adjoining small States" [without, however, indicating what is to become of the small States in the freeing process]; for Turkey, guarantee of safety [presumably superior in efficacy to that one which all the powers chose by common consent to disregard], Constantinople assured, and opportunity to develop under "the joint guardianship and encouragement of all the powers;" for Russia, free use of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles; for Belgium, full independence and indemnity; for England, an effectual guarantee that the Berlin-Bagdad enterprise will not menace her Indian Empire; for France, an effectual guarantee against aggression from Germany, and freedom to develop African and Asiatic colonies; and, lastly, for Finland, Poland, and Lithuania, independence as autonomous States, free from Russian domination. This, it is added, is possible only if peace negotiations are entered upon now.

... Among various views of the League to Enforce Peace not the least startling is that of Representative John Jacob Rogers, of Massachusetts, who finds it threatening "to open the nation's ports to the admission of millions of Oriental laborers." This ramification leading to the Far East appears in a letter written by the Congressman to Secretary Lansing, asking whether the Administration believes that it has the power to commit the United States to membership in an armed "International League to Enforce Peace" without the consent of Congress. In the course of his argument against this step, Mr. Rogers points out that membership in such a league would involve a "new epoch" in our history, so involving us in international affairs and "entangling alliances" that even such a question as our right to exclude Japanese and Chinese "cheap labor" would have to be arbitrated before a foreign tribunal.

... "How will the League to Enforce Peace treat rebellion?" asks the New York *Times*. "What, if anything, will the League do to or with a government which, while respecting the rights of its neighbors, treats its own subjects or citizens in such a way that they take up arms against it—in other words, that they rise in rebellion? . . . The right of rebellion is a precious one—perhaps the most precious that man possesses. It is exercised under heavy responsibility, and it is a means that requires the justification of an end obviously and demonstrably both good and adequate. Still it exists, and should exist, and if ever the notion gets out that the proposed League has for its object, or even among its objects, that of protecting all governments as they are, whether they deserved it or not, then the League would have some quite unnecessary antagonism to overcome, for there have been many bad governments, and pre-

sumably there are some bad ones now—governments from the overthrow of which the world would profit appreciably.”

. . . A debate of gigantic proportions has been undertaken by William Howard Taft and William Jennings Bryan, to be conducted by means of ten articles on each side, to be syndicated through the American and foreign press. The issue is to be the formation of a league of nations after the war to prevent, by force if necessary, a recurrence of the present cataclysm and the question of the advisability of this nation's joining such a league. Mr. Taft will take the side of the league, in which he advocates this country's membership. Mr. Bryan will oppose this proposition. The debate will be divided into three main topics: “Is the Platform of the League to Enforce Peace Feasible?” “Does the Platform of the League to Enforce Peace Furnish the Most Practical Plan for Securing Permanent Peace After the End of the Present War?” and “Should the United States Become a Signatory to the League to Enforce Peace?” Two arguments and a rebuttal will be written by each debater on each of these questions, followed by a tenth paper summing up the whole.

. . . The following resolutions express the views of a concourse of American citizens who met in Carnegie Hall, New York City, on the evening of December 15, in a protest meeting directed against the deportation of Belgians. The meeting, under the direction of Rev. Dr. William T. Manning, was addressed by James M. Beck, Alton B. Parker, Elihu Root, and President Hibben, of Princeton University. The resolutions read:

“That we, American citizens assembled in public meeting at Carnegie Hall, New York, express our abhorrence of these fresh outrages and violations of the laws of war, the law of nations, and the instincts of common humanity, deliberately perpetrated by the German government, and that we extend our sympathy to the unfortunate people thus made the victims of the calculated cruelty of the conquerors of an innocent nation.

“That we request the Government of the United States to protest with all its force and earnestness against these outrages; to emphasize the detestation with which the American people regard these abuses, and to request the German government, in the name of all neutrals, to cease its policy of expatriation and slavery; and we pledge our utmost support to the administration in whatever way it may conclude to act.

“That copies of these resolutions be sent to all the representatives of the German government who can be reached in this country.”

. . . The Hollywood High School Cosmopolitan Club, of Los Angeles, California, inaugurates what is, so far as is known, a new departure in peace work in the schools. The club writes this journal to learn whether any other such cosmopolitan clubs have been formed in any other high schools in the country, and to request that, if there be such clubs, they will correspond with the Hollywood organization and attempt to build up a national movement in this work. The Hollywood Club holds meetings every two weeks, at which its members are addressed by a lecturer telling of the people, customs, and conditions in some foreign country, with opportunity for discussion by members of the club. Once a month a “foreign dinner” is held. Stephen S. Myrick, the faculty sponsor of the club, states that “it has proved a very real force in building up a spirit of inter-

national friendship” among the pupils of the school. The officers of the club are: President, Arthur Garrett; vice-president, Harry Van Cleve; secretary-treasurer, Gavin Witherspoon.

. . . Following the publication of the President's note to the belligerents, the following communications were sent out from “Villa Serena,” Miami, Florida:

Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President:

You have rendered an invaluable service to a war-stricken world in asking the belligerent nations to set forth in specific terms the concessions and assurances which they deem necessary to the establishment of a lasting peace. It would be a reflection upon the nations at war to doubt that they know the ends for which they are fighting or to assume that they have any purposes which they are unwilling to reveal. A definite statement by both sides, no matter how far these statements may be apart, will clear the air and afford a basis for negotiations, and, when negotiations begin, they are not likely to terminate until an agreement is reached, because neither side will consent to assume responsibility for continuing the unspeakable horrors of this conflict, if any reasonable terms can be secured. Accept cordial congratulations and my earnest wish for the success of the movement which you have had the honor to inaugurate.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

David Lloyd George:

As a friend of all the nations at war, as a Christian and a lover of humanity, I respectfully but most earnestly appeal to you to use your great influence to secure your government's consent to negotiations.

There is no dispute that must necessarily be settled by force. All international disputes are capable of adjustment by peaceful means. Every guarantee that can possibly be secured by war can be stated as a condition precedent to peace. Do not, I pray you, by refusing an exchange of views assume responsibility for a continuation of the unspeakable horrors of this unparalleled conflict. Your decision may mean life or death to millions.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

. . . Notable results have been gained by a committee of educators, of which Stanley R. Yarnell, of the Friends' School of Germantown, Pennsylvania, is chairman, in an endeavor to provide means whereby indigent youths in Mexico may be assured material assistance in gaining a college education in this country. Letters were addressed by the committee to 508 presidents of institutions of learning, and the replies received open up a wealth of opportunity to students from Mexico and, so the promoters believe, to the establishment of the most friendly relations between this country and Mexico. Offers received by the committee range from free tuition to scholarships of \$400 and more a year. These come from over a hundred colleges and universities, among which are Williams College, Western Reserve University, University of Florida, University of Oklahoma, Fargo College, Oberlin, University of Chicago, Smith College, Bowdoin, University of Oregon, Simmons College (Texas), Syracuse, Rochester, and Leland Stanford Universities.